DAVID A. ROSENFELD, Bar No. 058163
WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD
A Professional Corporation
1001 Marina Village Parkway, Suite 200
Alameda, California 94501
Telephone (510) 337-1001
Fax (510) 337-1023
E-Mail: drosenfeld@unioncounsel.net

LISL SOTO, Bar No. 261875
WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD
800 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1320
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2607
Telephone (213) 568-4641
Fax (213) 443-5098
E-Mail: lsoto@unioncounsel.net

Attorneys for SERVICE EMPLOYEES
INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL 2015

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL 2015, Charging Party, and MONTECITO HEIGHTS HEALTHCARE & WELLNESS CENTER, Respondent.	No. 31-CA-129747 **MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Charging Party hereby moves the Board for reconsideration of its decision.

This motion is focused upon footnote 1. The Board buries its most vulnerable points in footnotes.

It is important to note that at no point did the General Counsel object to the arguments made by the Charging Party. It was the Board itself which raised this issue, not the General Counsel. It's hard to argue that the arguments are outside the scope of the Complaint when the General Counsel has not taken that position.

Here there were no pending claims or disputes. The Forced Unilateral Arbitration Procedure had been effective. No one filed any claims. Because there were no pending claims of any nature, the Federal Arbitration Act cannot apply.

We note that the Board's error in this regard is magnified by the point that the Federal Arbitration Act is not a statute which the Board administers and its views on the scope of the Federal Arbitration Act are, in fact, irrelevant. It's up to the courts to determine the application of the Federal Arbitration Act or other federal statutes. See, *Epic Sys. Corp. v. Lewis*, 138 S. Ct. 1612, 1629, 200 L. Ed. 2d 889, 908, 2018 U.S. LEXIS 3086, *34, (2018)("on no account might we agree that Congress implicitly delegated to an agency authority to address the meaning of a second statute it does not administer.").

Here the Board must preliminarily decide whether the Federal Arbitration Act applies. The Supreme Court's recent decision in *New Prime, Inc. v. Oliveira*, 17-340, confirms this. In that case, the Court made it clear that the Court had to decide whether the Federal Arbitration Act applied.

Nothing in the cases cited by the Board prevent a Charging Party from arguing that an affirmative defense which is a legal dispute over the application of a law asserted by a Respondent is legally insufficient particularly when the defense is based on a statute other than the National Labor Relations Act.

The Board has noted that it may find violations even they are not the theory of the General Counsel:

> To begin, we disagree with the Respondent's claim that the judge violated its due process rights by deciding this case on a legal theory that was not advanced by the General Counsel. Before the judge, the General Counsel argued that the Union needed to review the full, unredacted Home Services Provider (HSP) subcontracting agreement between DirecTV and the Respondent in order to determine whether those entities were joint employers for purposes of collective bargaining, or alternately to verify the Respondent's claims about the nature of their relationship. The judge rejected both arguments and found instead that the Union was entitled to see the full HSP to verify the Respondent's claim that it had furnished all portions of that document relative to the scope of bargaining-unit work.
>
> "The Board, with court approval, has repeatedly found violations for different reasons and on different *theories* from those of administrative law judges or the General Counsel, even in the absence of exceptions, where the unlawful conduct was alleged in the complaint." *Local 58, Int'l Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW), AFL-CIO (Paramount Industries, Inc.),* 365 NLRB No. 30, slip op. at 4 fn. 17 (2017) (emphasis in original) (citing cases); accord, e.g., *Davis Supermarkets, Inc. v. NLRB*, 2 F.3d 1162, 1169, 303 U.S. App. D.C. 193 (D.C. Cir. 1993), *cert. denied* 511 U.S. 1003, 114 S. Ct. 1368, 128 L. Ed. 2d 45 (1994). When analyzing whether a judge's finding of a violation on a theory that was not clearly articulated by the General Counsel violates a respondent's due process rights, the Board considers (1) whether the language of the complaint encompasses the legal theory upon which the violation was found; (2) whether the factual record is complete, or, in other words, whether the facts necessary to find a violation under the theory in question were litigated; (3) whether the law is well established; and (4) the General Counsel's representations about the theory of violation, and the differences between the litigated theory and the theory upon which the judge relied in finding the violation.

DirectSat USA, LLC, 366 NLRB No. 40 (2018), Motion for Reconsideration denied, 366 NLRB No. 141 (2018)

Charging Parties theories are encompassed within the allegations of the Complaint and were litigated from the beginning.

The Board's decision is spurious. In response to the Affirmative Defense of the application of the Federal Arbitration Act, the General Counsel or the Charging Party who has intervened is entitled to point out the legal error of applying a federal statute which the Board does not administer. Neither the General Counsel nor the Board has the right to take the position that another federal statute or constitutional issue cannot be raised.

For these reasons, the Motion for Reconsideration should be granted. Absent that, the Charging Party will take this case to a Circuit Court which we are convinced will reverse the Board. By the time it gets back to the Board, we will enjoy a new Board, appointed by a new President, who will respect the rights of workers.

Dated: February 4, 2019

WEINBERG, ROGER & ROSENFELD
A Professional Corporation

By:
/s/ David A. Rosenfeld
DAVID A. ROSENFELD
LISL R. SOTO
Attorneys for Charging Party, SERVICE EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION, LOCAL 2015

136402\1008625

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am a citizen of the United States and resident of the State of California. I am employed in the County of Alameda, State of California, in the office of a member of the bar of this Court, at whose direction the service was made. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action.

On February 4, 2019, I served the following documents in the manner described below:

MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

☑ (BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE) By electronically mailing a true and correct copy through Weinberg, Roger & Rosenfeld's electronic mail system from kkempler@unioncounsel.net to the email addresses set forth below.

On the following part(ies) in this action:

Executive Secretary
National Labor Relations Board
1015 Half Street SE
Washington, DC 20570-0001

Via E-Filing

Kamran Mirrafati
Richard M. Albert
Foley & Lardner LLP
555 South Flower Street, Suite 3500
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2411
(213) 486-0065 (fax)
kmirrafati@foley.com
ralbert@foley.com

Marissa Dagdagan, Esq.
National Labor Relations Board, Region 31
11500 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90064
Marissa.dagdagan@nlrb.gov

Joanna Silverman
Counsel for the General Counsel
11500 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90064
Joanna.silverman@nlrb.gov

Steven Wyllie
Counsel for the General Counsel
11500 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90064
steven.wyllie@nlrb.gov

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on February 4, 2019, at Alameda, California.

/s/ Karen Kempler
Karen Kempler